

The logo features a stylized black and white graphic of a person walking on a path that curves upwards and to the right. To the right of this graphic, the text "Northgate Stakeholders Homework Themes" is written in a bold, sans-serif font, with "April 20, 2004" below it. A thick blue horizontal bar with a black arrowhead pointing to the right is positioned below the text.

Northgate Stakeholders Homework Themes April 20, 2004

1. Think big picture and describe your main transportation goals:

Stakeholders were nearly unanimous in relating a vision of Northgate as a transit hub.

"Make Northgate an effective regional transportation hub in a way that benefits local businesses and residents without damaging neighborhoods."

Many pointed out the need to improve connections both to and across I-5 for pedestrians and vehicles. Suggestions included both overpasses and underpasses.

"...routes under I-5 and from north and south to link with Metro/light rail /monorail..."

Several group members suggested the need for better connections for those traveling east/west to existing north/south walkways or bus routes. If this was made easier, then citizens may choose a combination of walking or public transit to get to places like UW, Shoreline or Bellevue.

Stakeholders realize that improved circulation must emphasize safety – particularly for pedestrians and bikes.

"Safety, circulation, and connectivity are my main transportation goals ."

With improved safety Stakeholders said more people would choose to walk. Improving overall throughput to Northgate.

2. What transportation modes should be emphasized or are all modes equally important?

The majority of Stakeholders responded that all modes were important to Northgate and that it was smart to leverage the hub concept.

"All modes important for getting to the hub."

Once people have arrived at Northgate many Stakeholders suggested that pedestrians should have priority and echoing sentiments from the first question said that pedestrian safety was the main concern.

"All modes are important, however, pedestrian and bicycle safety is a high priority. Currently there are some dangerous conditions for pedestrian and bicycle that need to be corrected."

Another notion that was brought up suggested that by improving pedestrian and bike circulation the entire area would be more pleasant for both ped/bikes and vehicles.

“At the same time, improved pedestrian, bicycle and transit options will be good for business and will create an atmosphere that drivers also enjoy.”

Several members noted that the hub concept was valuable but that automobile traffic will always be a part of Northgate. Choosing not to accommodate car traffic would be potentially harmful, particularly in the short term.

“Someday we will all take the monorail or light rail to go shopping at Northgate, but that is 10+ years away, at best...to expect that the mall can be supported while restricting or discouraging vehicular access is unrealistic and will doom the mall--even a redeveloped one--to failure.”

3. What amount of traffic is acceptable on neighborhood streets? How could it best be managed?

Many Stakeholders said that a minimal amount of non-residential traffic was acceptable on neighborhood streets or that current levels could be maintained. A few stated that no non-residential should be allowed.

Several encouraged traffic calming techniques to ensure neighborhood streets were less appealing to cut through traffic.

“Post speed limits (25 mph) and enforce the limit...use traffic circles and speed bumps.”

The other side of the coin Stakeholders presented was making sure that major thoroughfares move freely so that vehicles are attracted to those rather than being tempted to cut through.

“Create efficient flow for vehicles on main roads to reduce the reason for short cut use of side streets. Access and adjust stoplight timing routinely. Attract pedestrians to controlled intersection to reduce j-walking dangers that slow traffic.”

No one suggested that current levels of cut through traffic should be allowed to increase.

4. What type of transportation investments should the City fund?

The Stakeholders encouraged the City not to limit itself by focusing on any one mode. Several prioritized pedestrian improvements while others noted that auto traffic was the most important. At least one member said that transit improvements should be left to the County.

“The City should help fund improvements for all modes with an emphasis on safety improvements; however, the safety improvements should be implemented in conjunction with other improvements. For example, if a pedestrian bridge is constructed over Northgate Way and/or NE 103rd Street, the bridge(s) should be designed with future road improvements in mind; we would not want to see the bridges constructed and later find out they are not wide enough for a widened roadway.”

Most Stakeholders did not identify how the City should fund improvements however a few members viewed the role of the development/business community quite differently.

“The City should continue to push for developers to pay for sidewalks and mitigation of increase traffic in the area. City should motivate this investment by developers through better design review and enforcement.”

“Focus on solutions that will have the greatest impact in reducing traffic first. Local businesses should not be asked to make improvements on City streets.”

Regardless of how improvements are paid for, a number of Stakeholders said that the City should work with the framework provided by the NCAP.

“The City should fund pedestrian, bicycle and public open space improvements per the NACP policies and implementation guidelines...”

The accompanying piece compares Stakeholder suggestions to the NCAP.